

15 May 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel Policy, Planning,
and Management

FROM : Chief, Policy Staff
DD/P&E/OPPPM

SUBJECT : Policy on Selecting New Professionals

REFERENCES : A. Memo from the DCI dtd 14 April 1980
(Pers 80-2174), same subject

B. Memo from IG to DCI dtd 14 April 1980
same subject

1. Your note forwarding reference A asked "could we write a policy?" The answer is yes, but there is an existing policy. In addition, there are a number of other ramifications to a professional selection policy that should be addressed in any change or reaffirmation of existing STATINTL policy.

2. In the existing policy, selection for employment [redacted] is based upon requirements for personnel that are developed by the Career Services or Operating Offices which include essential qualifications and, in most cases, potential for long-term service and career development. In addition, [redacted] indicates that initial screening and evaluation of applicants is accomplished through the review of written applications and personal interviews. If the screening suggests that an applicant may have qualifications of immediate interest, the application is brought to the attention of appropriate officials. The Professional Applicants Testing Battery (PATB) [redacted] is part of the initial screening process unless the office of assignment feels that such testing is not necessary. Thus, the present Agency policy is 1) selection by the line manager, 2) based upon possession of essential qualifications, 3) for a career association, and 4) PATB testing if the component desires. There are some areas of concern with the present policy and they include:

- definition of the level of manager (component head, first level supervisor, etc.) who select professional employees;
- the accuracy of the desired qualifications developed by the component;
- the dichotomy between the EEO desire for selection for entry level positions and the Agency goal for selection for career association; and,

- the required or elective use of the testing tool and if this test has been validated against the job requirements.

3. It appears that a change or reaffirmation of professional selection policy involves three decision areas.

- First, a decision as to the managerial level authorized to select professional employees.

- Second, a decision that selection of professional employees is based on either career association needs or, entry level job requirements.

- Third, a decision on how the Agency enters the field of job analysis both to determine qualifications against which the Agency hires and to validate the use of tests as a selection tool. The recommendations of the Task Force on EEO Selection Guidelines approved by the DDCI levy the requirement for job analysis on the Director, PPPM.

4. In order to appropriately prepare recommendations regarding these three decision areas, both time and involvement of organizational components other than OPPPM will be required. OPPPM has a major role due to its responsibility for recruitment, initial selection screening and job analysis. Staff Personnel Division, Recruitment Division, Policy Staff, and Position Management and Compensation Division all have interests affected by the policy on professional selection. OEEO has a role due to their concern over the entry-level vs. career question and interest in job analysis. In fact, [redacted] of OEEO recommends undertaking an ambitious job analysis program. More appropriate may be an option paper that outlines methodologies and procedures for a job analysis program and recommends a course of action. The Psychological Services Staff of OMS has a key role due to their responsibilities in professional selection testing and screening and because job analysis has a psychological base. The Inspector General appears to also have a role, according to [redacted] memo, due to the results of their inspection of the Agency's recruitment system and the psychological testing program.

5. There are two proposals indicated:

a. A memorandum to the DCI that encourages a discussion on professional selection policy, outlines the concerns expressed in this paper and presents a planned course of study. A draft of this memorandum is attached.

b. Launch a study, under the auspices of the Policy Staff, but with input from within OPPPM, EEO, OMS/PSS and the IG to address the three decision areas identified in paragraph 3.

APPROVED ()

DISAPPROVED ()

Director of Personnel Policy,
Planning, and Management

Attachment



STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : Harry E. Fitzwater
Director of Personnel Policy,
Planning, and Management

SUBJECT : Policy on Selecting New Professionals

REFERENCES : A. Your Memo dtd 14 April 1980 (ER 80-6933)
same subject

B. IG Memo to DCI dtd 14 April 1980
same subject

1. Your memorandum calls for a joint discussion on policy for selecting new professionals. The Inspector General has suggested delaying this discussion until you have received and reviewed the Inspection Report on the Agency's recruitment process and the psychological testing program. I also feel that the discussion would be more fruitful following receipt of the Inspection Report.

2. The present Agency policy on selecting new professional employees is based upon recruitment needs levied by the components upon my Recruitment Division, review of written applications and personal interviews by my staff, but final selection is made by the line manager based upon essential qualifications that the line manager develops. Selection is normally for a career association with the Agency. The use of psychological testing as a selection tool is dependent upon the line manager's desires. Review surfaced the following areas of concern with the present policy:

- Definition of the level of manager (component head, first level supervisor, etc.) who select professional employees.

- The accuracy of the desired qualifications developed by the component.
- The dichotomy between the EEO desire for selection for entry level positions and the Agency goal of selection for career association.
- The required or elective use of the testing tool and the validity of the test.

3. I am having the policy on selecting new professional employees studied and [redacted] parameters will be considered during the process. Initially I plan to address three basic areas.

- The managerial level authorized to select employees.
- The selection of new professionals for either a career association or entry level job requirement.
- The manner in which the Agency enters the field of job analysis. Job analysis should verify the qualifications against which the Agency hires and uses testing as a tool for selection. Job analysis may prove to be a lengthy and expensive process.

4. A joint discussion on this topic will be of help in focusing the study.

Harry E. Fitzwater

cc: DDCI
DDA
IG

"D/PPPM - Harry: The study is a major undertaking, and I wonder if we can afford the time and effort. Should we consider a preliminary meeting of addresses on DCI memo - DD/A, IG, D/Pers - to talk it out. Perhaps there is some middle ground that would not be as time-consuming.
DD/PPPM"

CONFIDENTIAL

Executive Registry
80-6933

14 April 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration
Inspector General
Director of Personnel Policy, Planning and Management

FROM: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT: Policy on Selecting New Professionals

25X1A 1. A few weeks ago by chance at a dinner party I met a [redacted]
[redacted] That very day he had been at the Agency, apparently on contract
to us, to look into our psychological testing procedures. After engaging
in a cocktail conversation with him about this, I asked him to let me
know the results of his findings. (C/NF)

25X1A

25X1A 2. He subsequently sent me a copy of a letter that he had written
to [redacted] reporting on his day of surveying our establishment. The
first three sections of this report appear to me to be some squabbling
between psychologists. Section IV, however, levies the basic criticism
that we don't have an overall policy guiding our selection of new pro-
fessionals. [redacted] tries to lay out some of the parameters of
such a policy. I'm not sure that I could write a policy from the basis
of his suggestions. I would most appreciate your jointly looking at
this and coming back to me for a discussion about what may or may not
be needed in this area. (C/NF)

25X1A

25X1A

[redacted]
STANFIELD TURNER

Attachment

cc: DDCI

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

Next 17 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Summary

The flavor of this report comes across as having been written by someone:

- (1) who was active in 1940-1950's testing psychology, but who has not kept up on new developments, such as assessment centers and test revisions,
- (2) who has had little practical experience in actually installing and operating selection systems in current organizations--the report essentially recommends a 1940/50 academic solution to the selection dilemma, a solution which, despite 30-40 years of recommendations in the textbooks, has never really worked anywhere that I am aware of,
- (3) who have mainly had a graduate student audience who were unempowered to answer back to either unfairness or nonsense--thus the report is peppered with snide, little digs that the authors would have trouble defending to knowledgeable professionals who disagree with them,
- (4) who has an EEOC axe to grind--that axe may well be worth grinding, but that cause is not well-served by the quality of this report.

STAT
the important
stuff starts
here
C IV. A suggestion for an overall Selection Policy.

STAT
My main criticism of the Agency's selection procedures is the apparent absence of any overall guiding policy for the selection of new professionals, a point that [redacted] [redacted] also made. The Agency's "Selection Policy," such as it is now, flows from a combination of the myriad decisions made:

- by managers asking for certain types of individuals,
- by recruiters in their efforts,

STAT

- by investigators doing background checks,
- by psychologists in their testing roles,
- by various administrative constraints, such as affirmative action concerns, and probably adversely,
- by the system that frequently forces a lengthy delay between time of initial interview and final job offer.

The net result is that the selection policy makes itself through the interaction of these forces.

(A caveat here: the Agency, by its nature, is not an open institution; consequently an outsider gropes blindly for solid data about what is happening. The preceding paragraph is based mostly on small wispy clues, hunches, and educated guesses, not on hard data. The reader should be cautious; I may be wrong.)

An explicit, comprehensive policy for the selection of the Agency's new professionals would be a great help in deciding precisely what selection techniques should be used.

The policy should come from on high; the implementation should be the responsibility of the Psychological Services Staff.

My suggestion would be that at least the following points be addressed in an overall policy.

I. TALENT: The Agency wishes to hire the best talent(s) available for its mission. Because a range of talents is necessary, multiple, overlapping categories should be considered. Here are the most likely categories: (again, from the viewpoint of a relatively naive outsider)

A. Analytical

1. A general facility with words and numbers.
2. The ability to see themes in murky material.

3. The ability to conduct numerical analyses.
4. The ability to analyze and summarize written material.
5. The ability to forecast future trends from current material.

B. Technical Training

1. A solid background in some area relevant to the Agency's mission; perhaps
 - (a) mathematics/computer sciences
 - (b) physical sciences
 - (c) economics
 - (d) political science
 - (e) agriculture

C. Communications Skills

1. The ability to write clearly and crisply.
2. The ability to report orally, both one-on-one, and as a briefing officer.
3. Persuasive ability as necessary.

D. Language Skills.

III. STABILITY: The superficial image of the Agency is one of a James Bond world of intrigue, danger, excitement, sex and money. Consequently, the applicant pool has a disproportionate number of shallow, unstable, occasionally even psychotic, thrill-seekers. The selection procedures should weed them out. But balanced against this is the hard fact that the Agency needs to attract people who are willing to live unusual, atypical lives; for them part of the motivation is surely the sense of differentness involved. Consequently, policy here has to walk the fine line between the following two orientations (they are not necessarily either/or):

1. Personal soundness:

- (a) Strength of convictions in the accepted mores of our culture (e.g., that elected officials are ultimately responsible).
- (b) Tolerance for stress and ambiguity.
- (c) A generally optimistic view of life.
- (d) The ability to grow, not to stagnate.
- (e) An absence of mental, legal, financial, or physical problems.

2. A certain venturesomeness

- (a) Willingness to seek and experience change.
- (b) Calmness in the face of hazards.
- (c) Flexibility in the area of personal comfort.
- (d) A generally positive orientation toward risk.

III. MANAGERIAL POTENTIAL: Presumably the Agency is hiring for careers, not entry level positions, and because managerial talent comes mainly from within, the leaders of the future are now being hired. Consequently, some thought should be given to the future in the selection process. At least the following factors may be involved.

1. A willingness to seek more responsibility.

Those who move up the administrative ladder are more willing, even eager, to accept additional responsibility and suffer the related consequences.

2. The ability to follow and learn from older models.

Following a "mentor" is one of the most common routes to top management. Those capable of selecting and being selected by people who are excellent teachers will more often be found in the higher reaches of management. (Psychologists currently know virtually nothing about how to select for this characteristic.)

3. An air of "competitiveness."

Good leaders are usually competitive, physically active, willing to risk losing for the sake of winning.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSTRAINTS: There are certain external constraints that affect hiring practices; they, of course, must be recognized. At the moment, for example, affirmative action policies must be part of the overall selection policies.

V. "FOREIGN" ORIENTATION: I don't really know what I am talking about here, but the point seems too important to ignore. Because of the nature of its charter, the Agency needs to be an internationally oriented institution. Consequently, other characteristics being equal, those applicants are most desirable who have:

1. Lived, worked, or traveled extensively overseas, or
2. Have spent years studying other cultures, or
3. Have been raised by an internationally oriented family, or by a family from another culture, or, most preferably,
4. Some combination of the above 3.

SUMMARY

I am aware of the arrogance exhibited here in proposing an Agency selection policy on the basis of a one-day visit. Still, the absence of such a policy seems to be at the heart of the current dilemma. With such a policy, the necessary implementation could be done, and, in theory at least, some evaluation research could be conducted. As it stands now, those responsible for doing the work are at the mercy of outside experts who, free from the constraints of suggesting something that might work within the Agency's desired policy, are free to take potshots at the current procedures without worrying about practical reality.

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/05/09 : CIA-RDP92-00455R000100170013-3

Next 8 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/05/09 : CIA-RDP92-00455R000100170013-3